

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
SOUTHERN DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

CASE NO. 19-mj-30488

v.

D-1 VANCE PEARSON,

Defendant.

**STIPULATION TO CONTINUE PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION AND  
COMPLAINT**

By and through their respective counsel, **THE PARTIES STIPULATE** and agree that there is good cause to continue the preliminary examination and complaint from November 20, 2019 to January 6, 2020.

**IT IS FURTHER STIPULATED** that the time period from November 20, 2019, through and including January 6, 2020, shall be deemed excludable delay under the provisions of the Speedy Trial Act, Title 18, United States Code, Section 3161, in consideration of Section 3161(h)(7)(A), that the ends of justice served by continuing the preliminary examination and complaint outweigh the best interests of the public and Defendant in a speedy trial.

The parties stipulate and agree that an ends of justice continuance is appropriate for the following reasons:

1. On September 12, 2019, a criminal complaint charged Defendant Vance Pearson (“Pearson”) with Embezzlement of Union Funds in violation of 29 U.S.C. § 501(c); Filing False LM Reports and Maintaining False Union Records in violation of 29 U.S.C. § 439(b) and (c); Mail and Wire Fraud in violation of 18 U.S.C. §§ 1341 & 1343; Money Laundering in violation of 18 U.S.C. §§ 1956 & 1957; and conspiracies to commit and aiding and abetting these offenses in violation of 18 U.S.C. §2 and 18 U.S.C. § 371. (R.1: Complaint, 1).

2. Federal agents arrested Pearson the same day and he had an initial appearance before a United States Magistrate Judge in the Eastern District of Missouri. (R.5: Rule 5 Documents). He appeared with counsel. (*Id.*). The magistrate judge scheduled a removal hearing for September 17, 2019. (*Id.*).

3. On September 17, 2019, Pearson appeared for his removal hearing. (*Id.*). He waived an identity hearing and requested that his preliminary hearing be held in this district at a time set by this court. (*Id.*). He was further ordered to appear in this district on September 24, 2019. (*Id.*).

4. Prior to the September 24, 2019 date, Pearson’s original attorney and government counsel agreed to adjourn his appearance in this district while he

searched for counsel. Pearson hired undersigned defense counsel, who entered an appearance in this matter on October 1, 2019. (R.6: Appearance, 55).

5. On November 12, 2019, the parties met in St. Louis in part so the government could provide documents and information for the Defendant and his counsel to consider in order to determine whether any pre-indictment resolution could be reached.

6. The parties agree to adjourn the preliminary examination for approximately 45 days to allow defense counsel and the Defendant time to schedule travel to this district for any such hearing, for defense counsel to (if necessary) find and hire local defense counsel, and to allow defense counsel to review the criminal charges and further discuss the same with government counsel, e.g., to determine whether there could be any pre-indictment resolution.

7. The parties agree that the ends of justice served by continuing the preliminary examination and complaint outweigh the best interests of the public and Defendant in a speedy trial.

8. The parties also stipulate and agree that this stipulation and any order resulting therefrom shall not affect any previous order of pretrial detention or pretrial release.

Accordingly, the parties request that the Court find that, under the Speedy Trial Act, Title 18, United States Code, Section 3161(h) (7)(A), the period of delay, as a result of the continuance, shall be excluded in computing the time within which the information or indictment must be filed.

So stipulated:

s/David Gardey  
Assistant U.S. Attorney  
211 W. Fort Street, Ste. 2001  
Detroit, MI 48226  
(313) 226-9591  
David.Gardey@usdoj.gov

Dated: November 18, 2019

s/N. Scott Rosenblum (w/ consent)  
Attorney for Defendant  
120 S. Central Avenue, Suite 130  
Clayton, Missouri 63105  
(314) 862-4332  
[srosenblum@rsflawfirm.com](mailto:srosenblum@rsflawfirm.com)

Dated: November 18, 2019

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
SOUTHERN DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

CASE NO. 19-mj-30488

v.

D-1 VANCE PEARSON,

Defendant.

\_\_\_\_\_ /

**ORDER TO CONTINUE PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION AND  
COMPLAINT**

The Court, having been fully advised by the respective parties, states as follows:

**IT IS ORDERED** that the preliminary examination and complaint is continued from November 20, 2019 to January 6, 2020 at 1:00PM.

**IF IS FURTHER ORDERED** that the time period from November 20, 2019, through and including January 6, 2020, shall be deemed excludable delay under the provisions of the Speedy Trial Act, Title 18, United States Code, Section 3161, in consideration of Section 3161(h)(7)(A) for the reasons set forth in the parties' stipulation, which is incorporated by reference—including to allow defense counsel to review the criminal charges and discuss the same with government counsel, e.g., to determine whether there could be any pre-indictment resolution—and, that the

ends of justice served by continuing the preliminary examination and complaint outweigh the best interests of the public and Defendant in a speedy trial.

This order shall not affect any previous order of pretrial detention or pretrial release.

Accordingly, the Court shall find that, under the Speedy Trial Act, Title 18, United States Code, Sections 3161(h)(7)(A), the period of delay, as a result of the continuance, shall be excluded in computing the time within which the information or indictment must be filed.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

s/David R. Grand  
DAVID R. GRAND  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

Date Entered: 11/19/19